



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/611,799

06/30/2003

Nigel S. Keam

MS1-1589US

5078

22801 7590 03/23/2009

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

HALL, ARTHUR O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/23/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/611,799	Applicant(s) KEAM ET AL.	
	Examiner ARTHUR O. HALL	Art Unit 3714	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ARTHUR O. HALL. (3) ____.

(2) Ningning Xu. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 18 March 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Shimakawa et al. (US7,275,987) and DeStefano (US6,304,259).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants described and explained the function of the invention with respect to Fig. 4. Applicants and Examiner discussed the proposed claim amendments and other suggested claim amendments that would be prospectively obviate rejections in view of Shimakawa and DeStefano. Examiner will consider any arguments and/or amendments in response to the Non-final Office Action dated 2/2/2009.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Arthur O Hall/ Examiner, Art Unit 3714	/Peter D. Vo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714
--	---